

1 Gary S. Lincenberg – State Bar No. 123058
glinenberg@birdmarella.com
2 Ariel A. Neuman – State Bar No. 241594
aneuman@birdmarella.com
3 Gopi K. Panchapakesan – State Bar No. 279586
gpanchapakesan@birdmarella.com
4 BIRD, MARELLA, BOXER, WOLPERT, NESSIM,
DROOKS, LINCENBERG & RHOW, P.C.
5 1875 Century Park East, 23rd Floor
Los Angeles, California 90067-2561
6 Telephone: (310) 201-2100
Facsimile: (310) 201-2110

7 Attorneys for Movant John Brunst
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION**
11

12 **In the Matter of the Seizure of:**

13 Any and all funds held in Republic
Bank of Arizona Account(s) xxxx1889,
14 xxxx2592, xxxx1938, xxxx2912, and
xxxx2500.
15

CASE NO. 2:18-cv-06742-RGK-PJW

**MOVANT JOHN BRUNST'S
JOINDER IN JAMES LARKIN'S
OPPOSITION TO
GOVERNMENT'S *EX PARTE*
APPLICATION TO EXTEND
DEADLINE AND HEARING**

Date: September 24, 2018
Time: 9:00 A.M.
Crtrm.: 850

Assigned to Hon. R. Gary Klausner

1 TO THE COURT AND ALL COUNSEL OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT Movant John Brunst, by and through his
3 counsel, will and hereby does join in James Larkin's Opposition to the
4 Government's *Ex Parte* Application to Extend Deadline and Hearing (the
5 "Opposition") [D.E. 41], and adopts all of the positions set forth in the Opposition
6 as if fully set forth herein.

7 Mr. Brunst joins in the Opposition because he is "so similarly situated [to
8 Mr. Larkin] that filing an independent [opposition] would be redundant." *Tatung*
9 *Co., Ltd. v. Shu Tze Hsu*, 217 F. Supp. 3d 1138, 1151 (C.D. Cal. 2016). Like
10 Mr. Larkin, Mr. Brunst holds an interest in assets that were seized pursuant to civil
11 seizure warrants issued by the magistrate judges in this District, and which are the
12 subject of Mr. Larkin's Motion to Vacate or Modify Seizure Warrants (the "Seizure
13 Motion") [D.E. 6].¹ The Opposition raises issues that are directly relevant to and
14 overlap with the seizures of Mr. Brunst's assets. All of the arguments made in the
15 Opposition therefore apply with equal force to the seizure warrants issued against
16 the assets in which Mr. Brunst holds an interest.

17
18 ¹ On August 6, 2018, Mr. Brunst filed a joinder in the Seizure Motion as to the
19 three seizure warrants that purport to seize assets in which Mr. Brunst holds an
20 interest. D.E. 9. Counsel understands that the 17 other seizure warrants that purport
21 to seize funds derived from Backpage.com advertisements that allegedly solicited
22 prostitution have been consolidated with the above-captioned seizure warrant, and
23 were subsequently transferred from Magistrate Judge Walsh to District Judge
24 Klausner as a new civil action. D.E. 14. Subsequent orders from the Court indicate,
25 however, that Mr. Brunst's joinder in the Seizure Motion may not have been
26 accepted. *See* D.E. 20, 37. Like Mr. Larkin, Mr. Brunst is a defendant in the related
27 criminal case pending in the District of Arizona, whose assets were seized in this
28 District after the indictment in that case issued. Mr. Lacey, also a defendant in the
related criminal case, filed an identical joinder in the Seizure Motion (the only
difference being the warrants at issue), which appears to have been accepted by the
Court. *See* D.E. 26. Counsel for Mr. Brunst has sought guidance from the
Courtroom Deputy Clerk on the status of his joinder in the Seizure Motion, and is
awaiting a response.

1 DATED: August 29, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

2 Gary S. Lincenberg
3 Ariel A. Neuman
4 Gopi K. Panchapakesan
5 Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert, Nessim,
6 Dooks, Lincenberg & Rhow, P.C.

7
8 By: /s/ Gary S. Lincenberg
9 Gary S. Lincenberg
10 Attorneys for Movant John Brunst
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28